YEŞIM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 22nd of February 2023 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. Just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Steinar Grøtterød, Alberto Soto, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Satish Babu, Dave Kissoondoyal, and from Claire Craig. And from staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Chantelle Doerksen, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call and I will be doing call management. As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation. Our interpreters are Marina and Paula on the Spanish channel, and on the French channel we have Camila and Claire.

As usual, we have real-time transcription service providers on today's call. Let me share the link with you here on Zoom chat. Please do check the service.

Before we get started, the final reminder is to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. With this, I would like to leave the floor. Over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to today's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. We have a light agenda this week. First, we'll go through the workgroup and small team updates with just an update on the closed generics, as most of the other groups have not got any specific, significant updates for this week. And then we'll go into the policy comment updates with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia El Miniawi with a couple of comments in the pipeline and currently being under consideration. After that, we shall look through the At-Large planning for ICANN76 follow-up from last week. And then Any Other Business. At this point in time, is there anything that anyone wishes to change in the agenda, additions, deletions etc.? I am not seeing any hands up. So that means we are not going to change the agenda and it's adopted as it currently is on your screen.

We can go straight to the next part of the agenda and that is the action items. Thank you. You can see they're all completed, all pertaining to either this call … For some of the drafts that are being prepared, one being the proposed procedure for selecting a top-level domain string for private use, and the other one, the additional script-based reference Label Generation Rules and related updates. And of course, we'll be looking at these today. So again, let's open the floor for any comments/ questions. I see Jonathan Zuck is with us, who might speak up during AOB. I think that Jonathan will probably take us through the preparation for ICANN76. Welcome back, Jonathan.

Let's go on. The agenda is adopted, the action items are looked at, and there are no comments so we can go straight to agenda items three, the workgroup and small team updates. This week, a number of apologies have been received from group leaders. The Transfer Policy Review

Policy Development Process has had some progress, but no one was available for today's call as there is a conflict with other calls that took place with the last call of the TPR PDP. I think the ALAC call took place at the same time. So anyway, we'll have a further update next week on this.

The Expedited PDP on IDNs has no update this week. Again, I guess I shouldn't go through the whole lot, but the only one is the closed generics. And for this, we have Greg Shatan and Alan Greenberg who can provide us with an update.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Olivier, Alan is an apology and I don't see Greg on the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was just checking. Oh dear. Well, this is the only one that's currently listed as being an update and we have neither of the people in charge. Right. I think maybe we'll go immediately to policy comment update. That's going to be a very short call. Policy comment update, and then we'll come back to agenda item three, if either of the two has turned up. I see Alan as an apology. We can try and check with Greg. So let's go to agenda item four, pushing this forward with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia El Miniawi.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Olivier. A really quick update, and then I'll turn it over to Hadia to guide us through the substance of the two items that we've received comments on under the open public comment summary. Recently

ratified, as you may recall, was the draft statement—it's no draft anymore—but it's the ICANN draft FY24-28 Operating and Financial Plan and the draft FY24 Operating Plan and Budget. Those comments were submitted on the 13th. So if you'd like to see them, please visit the workspace.

Upcoming proceedings, nothing has changed. There's something coming on the RZERC Charter Review. The Technical Check Review is still expected to come later this month. And then in March, we have pending the ccNSO Policy Development Process on the selection of IDN ccTLDs and the NCAP Study 2 draft report. So lots of things coming. And because we have comments on both of those two items that are under the open proceedings, I'll turn it over to Hadia to walk us through that. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Hi. Currently we have two open procedures, as Chantelle said, and they're both under consideration. The first is the proposed procedure for selecting a top-level domain string for private use. So I have sent over e-mail a proposed comment. You can also find it on the wiki page, and Chantelle has also created a Google Doc on which you could provide your comment.

Generally, the proposed procedure is that IANA develops a set of candidate strings where each string in the set is considered to match all four criteria that were set by SAC113, namely, that the string is a valid DNS label, that the string is not already delegated in the root zone, that

it is not confusingly similar to another TLD in existence, and that it is relatively short, memorable, and meaningful.

So the first and second criteria can be factually validated, while the third and fourth are sort of subjective because different communities of Internet users could measure similarity and confusability differently. Also, different populations could have different opinions about what could be considered memorable or meaningful. Again, from the set of candidate strings, a preferred candidate will be identified through deliberation within an internal evaluation team. IANA could of course consult with any relevant expertise informing its decision, if required or needed.

So after the string is selected, IANA will publish a short document explaining its selection. After that, ICANN Org with hold a public comment proceeding on the draft selected document. The proceeding will only ask if IANA followed the procedure but would not allow commenting on the string itself. Since part of the criteria used for determining the string includes some subjective issues that could differ from one user community to another, allows commentary on the string itself would be useful in increasing the chance that the selected string is actually used. So, as we all know, ICANN cannot force people to use specific strings. So, even if IANA decides on a specific string to be used for private use, that doesn't mean that people will be obligated to use it. So, unless they think it is suitable for them to use, they might not use it.

So, basically, the ALAC comment says that we propose that the comment is also open on the string itself and not only on the procedure.

This is again to get input from users regarding, for example, confusability of the string itself, meaningful, memorable strings that are already highly used. So, basically, this is what the comment says. Again, you can find it on the Google Doc, on the wiki page, and on the e-mail. I'll stop here and I'm open for any questions. Yes, Christopher, go ahead. Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Right.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yes. We can hear you. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Just to kick off the conversation with a very naive question. First of all, the chat, the exchange between John McCormac and Alfredo Calderon has stimulated my interest. But my question is what exactly is a private TLD? Who is the private person or organization? And what would it be useful? Is it different from a closed generic?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yes. A private TLD is intended for internal use. So it's not intended at all to leak out to the public Internet or be resolved publicly. It's only intended for internal use. So, for example, some organization could use .home or .corp, again, in order to resolve internally but it is not meant at all to be resolved externally. The problem is that some entities could assign TLDs that are already delegated in the root zone or maybe they

could assign a TLD that is not today in the root zone, but in the future, it could be delegated in the root zone. Then the problem happens if this TLD leaks to the outside world and is resolved externally. So collision could happen. Also, there are some security issues that could be associated with that if it is resolved externally. The closed generic is a top-level domain that actually is resolved not internally but it is resolved externally as well, but this one is not. And that's why, I'll tell again, ICANN cannot obligate any entity to use or not use the string that it will assign for private use. But again, it would be a recommendation to use it. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay, I get it. But then John McCormac's question is very relevant. And furthermore, it seems to me that there's plenty of scope here for collisions. But I'll leave that to the working group to sort out. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Christopher. Olivier, yeah, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia, for explaining this very well. I just wanted to add that the reason, really, for this whole process is the work that ICANN have done in trying to find out how widespread are collisions with people's private domain spaces where people run their own top-level domains within their organization, and then it leaks out, miss resolvers that are not actually configured correctly, etc. And it has caused some more marginal problems on the Internet. But of course,

the two largest contentions that we've seen are the .corp and .home, which for many years were used quite widely by people to set up their private networks, which has led to the current deadlock that we have with .corp and .home. There are others as well to a much lesser extent. And what they're trying to do here as part of enhancing the stability of the DNS is to actually have something that is like a reserved name in some way, a reserved name that people can use in their own private networks. That means that public resolvers out there, if they come across that TLD request, can immediately just discard the request because it's not meant to be for the whole DNS structure as such. I think that's what they're looking at. I don't have the exact details of how it will work out but I can imagine that's the way, just to make sure. A little bit like in IPv6, there are some addresses that are not meant for being routed around the world, or in IPv4 also, IP addresses like 1.2.7.0 is also a local address. I think they're trying to get a top-level domain to be also just a local TLD not to be used. That's it. Thank you.

One of the quick questions, just my second part to my intervention is down to really what the ALAC thinks about this process. You could see the choice of TLD will be entirely made by those by IANA, by the people part of that committee, and there just appears to be the public consultation does not appear to be a case of, oh yeah, do we agree with this name or do we not agree with this name? It's more of a case of, the process for checking for selection, did that follow a correct root to do it? And was it a correct process or was it not a correct process? So it does limit the amount of commenting that our community could do. Do we want to have an opinion on this? It might just open a Pandora's Box with thousands of suggestions for another name to be used than the

one that's proposed, I don't know. Should we bother is the other question. Or should we just trust that the people that IANA know what they're doing? Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. With that, I pose the same question to you. So please let us know if we should go with a comment in relation to the string itself in being able to comment on the choice of string itself or there is no need for that, just as Olivier said. So again, you have this on the wiki page. Any more questions or comments?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I just put a little question in the chat.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Oh, yes. Will private TLDs extend to IDNs? Well, yes, they might. Why not? This is only about the first selected strings for private use. Maybe in the future, more strings could be added. Maybe also IDN strings could be added. It is possible. Whether it will happen or not, I don't know.

So, people, what do you think? Should we go ahead with a comment or not? Maybe we could do a quick poll. Olivier, is that possible, just to get the sense of the room?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is indeed a possibility. We could do a quick poll on the call. I just wonder. I'm not seeing anyone jump up and down and say, "We need

to, we need to, we need to." Often, unless there is a real need for this, then we just don't respond. At the moment, I'm not seeing anybody going crazy over this. Open/close quotes regarding going crazy with no medical intent on that.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Do we even have a position? Okay. So I guess we could decide not to proceed with a comment. If you object to not proceeding with a comment, please raise your hand or indicate that in the chat. I see no one objecting to not going with a comment, so consensus call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me just jump in quickly. In general, unless somebody really wants to comment and steps forward and says, "Right, let's do it," then our default position is no comment. So I think that on this occasion, I'm not seeing anyone step up and trying to argue a case that we need to comment, we can put it for the time being as being no comment. And if next week somebody changes their mind or in the meantime changes their mind and wants to proceed forward, then they can put forward their proposal. But I'd say no comment. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. So no comment. Christopher, you put in the chat, "I would like to see the point of view of the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean group." Could you elaborate a little bit of that?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Basically, I agree with Olivier's conclusion. I don't want to go around in circles. But the purpose of my comment is that with my limited knowledge of Chinese character, I do believe that the same character appears in different languages with different meanings. There I think the scope for collisions and confusion, if these any of these things actually do leak, and apparently they might, that's one area where the IANA group would have to understand what's going on. But that's for the users in parts of the world which is, as far as I can see, not particularly well represented on today's call. So let's leave that for other people and for next week. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Christopher. But again, we need to remember that IANA is going to be doing the deliberation as well as to consult with any relevant expertise, if needed. That includes the SSAC, the IETF, and other groups. Thank you. So the decision here is not to proceed with a comment.

Let's now go to our next open public procedure, and that is about the additional script-based reference Label Generation Rules and related updates. Satish has actually developed a statement. I have made some edits to it, as well as Bill Jouris. So if we could have that. Satish, unfortunately, was not able to join us today because he is traveling. So if we could have the document on the screen, please.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Sorry. I'm not sure which link that needs to be displayed, actually, the workspace.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: It's a Google Document link. I'll post the link in the chat. I post the link.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Okay. Just waiting to see the link.

BILL JOURIS: Yeşim, it was up further on the comments. What's the phrase?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Okay. I think you have it, just shared it.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Bill, I would like to give you the floor to kick it off. Please go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: Okay. I've only just read the draft five minutes ago so I'm not sure how well I can comment on it extensively. The primary concern I have is the proposed document does everything based on the Root Zone LGRs that were developed by the various script panels and specifically their views on variants were developed with the explicit understanding that those variants applied only to the root zone, which as it's set up, will always have a manual review of proposed TLDs. Therefore, the variants could be kept very narrow because that manual review would pick up on various confusions which might not be covered by the variants, and to use those blanket on the second level domains where obviously there is

no manual review and cannot be seems like an error. I would also note that the Latin panel, which I sat on, was asked about this and we specifically recommended a different criteria for variants which would substantially expand the number and there's no sign that that is reflected anywhere in the document. So I have some concerns there, in addition to the concerns that are in the documents that Satish drafted already. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Bill. Also, now, as you all know, there is the EPDP on gTLD IDNs going on and the PDP on ccTLD IDNs going on. Both of them are setting policy for variants. Also in those policies and, I believe, also in SubPro maybe, it has been determined that the Root Zone Label Generation Rules going forward would be the only source for calculating variant allocatable strings and blocked strings.

Sébastien previously has raised concerns in relation to Quebec written in English and Quebec with the E with a grave accent, and that it is not possible to allocate it based on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. We could have similar cases also if we look at Cancún. Also you have a U with a grave versus the U. So basically, the comment is addressing those issues and the need of certain communities to have their TLDs expressed. We point out also in the document that Quebec which has an E with a grave accent is an IDN variant because the label includes a non-ASCII character, and as such, this issue could be addressed through the EPDP and the PDP that are currently going on.

So, I'll stop here and ask others for their thoughts and comments. Again, there's a link here to the document. Please go ahead and read it and provide your comments. Do you have any initial thoughts on that, on this issue or on the comment itself on the proposed statement? I don't see any hands up. Again, you have now the link to the document. We could also circulate it in an e-mail. Please think about it and provide your comments and thoughts so that we can go ahead with the comment, if you would like actually the ALAC to have a comment. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Just one thing to add, Hadia, is that I've also let [inaudible] from .quebec know about this document. So he'll likely be looking at this as well. That's it. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Thank you so much, Olivier. So the document is open. We don't have much time. I think this closes on the 1st of March. So you have a week. Please go ahead and think about it. I'm seeing now hands up and hearing no voice, I'll stop here. I hand it over back to you, Olivier, thank you, unless Chantelle has something to add.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Nothing for me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Chantelle. Now, I've checked the participants list. I have not seen Greg Shatan on there. And as we know, Alan is an apology. So I think we can just move on and go to our next agenda item, and that's ICANN76 At-Large planning. That's likely to be a significant chunk because Jonathan Zuck is back with us. He's going to be able to take us through some preparation for this important meeting. So over to you, Jonathan. I know Chantelle is also involved with that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Olivier. Thanks for having me back. You my voice is a little bit nasally and stuff like that but I'm on the road to recovery. Chantelle, do you want to start by just summarizing the sort of administrative components of things that have changed in terms of the schedule and things like that, and then we'll dive into a couple of the discussions?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jonathan. Sure. The first bullet point is a reminder that Prep Week is next week. It will run from Monday to Wednesday. So please go ahead and register for that, if you haven't already. The next bullet point, what we're going to be discussing in depth today, is the At-Large internal deep dive session on SubPro and the agenda for that and the slides that we'll be preparing. We'll get to that in a moment.

Next is the ICANN76 Board questions to the ALAC. We've talked about this last week, which was what can the Board do better? What can the Board do to better appreciate our volunteer work? What are the most

pressing issues pending implementation for end users? So the discussions on that are ongoing. The workspace link is in the agenda as well. Within the next week and a half or so, the speakers for the bilateral with the Board will have to be identified, and we will have to submit those topics to the Board by March 1. So we're getting down to the wire with that.

Next we have the At-Large community session, which is the ALAC Hosted Community Session: Unfinished Business and the Role of the ODP. That is looking to be a panel. We're still waiting for confirmation if the Board can attend or not. It is double-booked with the bilateral with the SSAC. So we're still working through that there. Either way, it looks like it will be a good discussion.

The ICANN76 talking points are still underway as well. The shepherds have added their input and will continue to do so through the 28th. Then on next week's CPWG call, which will land on the 1st of March, we will review those talking points.

As always, all of this information, as well as the draft agendas, can be found in the ICANN76 At-Large workspace, which is the final link in the agenda for this item. With that, Jonathan, I'll turn it back over to you to walk us through the SubPro session for ICANN76.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Chantelle. Thanks, everyone. We have presented to the Board with fairly extensive advice on Subsequent Procedures, and then followed that up, as you recall, with correspondence prior to the Board workshop that took place about a month ago also on Subsequent

Procedures. One aspect of that most recent correspondence, both from us and from the GNSO, was the kind of false dichotomy between Option 1 and Option 2 with respect to the timing of a new round. And the net result of that, we learned from layout on the ALAC call yesterday, is that the Board is looking into developing an alternative, more fleshed out version of so-called Option 2, which if you recall was the sort of 18-month version, which I don't think was ever realistic. But it was certainly a big difference from the Option 1 with suggested of five years until a new round.

There was the all-hands meeting about a week ago with all of the staff of ICANN, it was made clear that—Sally Costerton's top priorities were getting the new round going and getting the WHOIS data access system up and running. Those are the two big priorities. The second one is certainly a priority for us, and the first one is one that we've been doing a lot of work on. But I think all of that together suggests that we're now entering what might be called the horse trading aspect of these conversations. In other words, we've been fairly thorough in carving out the areas of interest to individual end users, focusing in on those issues, but still fairly thorough in making some demands associated with a new round, including implementation of the CCT recommendations that came out of both the CCT Review and the SSR2 Review.

So I think where the Board is coming with their second question is, can you put these requests in order and draw a line somewhere that says that must-have, nice-to-have or something like that, some sort of a distinction between them, so that I'm balanced with a more accelerated timeframe associated with a new round. We have them focused on implementation of the recommendations that mean the most to us. So

that is, I think, our biggest objective here in the near term, is really to revisit the recommendations that we've made with respect to a new round and the recommendations we've endorsed, I guess, in the case of the CCT Review, and really try to prioritize where they stand from our perspective.

There was a prioritization exercise that was led by Cheryl at one point, and so we should incorporate that information as well. But I think that the main purpose of this session at ICANN76 will be to go through these recommendations and try and prioritize them for the Board, make it into something that allows them to be responsive to us but not allow the time to be indefinite associated with a new round.

So we could start that conversation here or at the call next week. But that will be the primary purpose of this session that we have in the weekend leading up to ICANN76, and hopefully prepare us for our meeting with the Board where we answer those questions, particularly the second question about the most pressing issues pending for end users. I'll stop there and ask if there's any question or discussion at this moment about that, but I think that's probably the biggest task in front of us is to really prepare the ALAC for some horse trading with the GNSO and the Board with respect to what has to happen prior to new round.

I guess I was unusually clear. That's good. So no questions on that. So that will be the agenda for that session. I'm thinking … what is the best way, Chantelle? What's the best thing for us to share for people on this call to begin to think about these questions offline? Is it the Board Recommendation/Implementation spreadsheet? Is that complete

enough between the ALAC Rec and the CCT Recs for us to try and prioritize them? What do you think, Chantelle, is the best tool for people to go through these prior to discussing them?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jonathan. I have to admit, I'm not sure at this point. I can take that back and we can discuss internally with staff.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. For everyone on the call, we have a number of different places that we're kind of tracking these different things. There's a spreadsheet that is maintained by Board staff that kind of delves in a very high level to the recommendations we've made and sort of what their status is. We've given feedback to that particular tool because I think we're looking for a little bit more granular understanding of the status of different recommendations. Because somebody might just say in process but it's been in process for several years, etc., and try to understand where things are and what the opportunity is for completion. I think it'd be critical for us to have this conversation with the Board and really start talking about what's essential. Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. First of all, sorry to be late. I just heard the last three minutes of your talk. I guess that Cheryl is not on this call. I don't want to talk on her behalf but I am sure that the work we have done in the OFB subgroup about prioritization is a tool we need to use for doing the

work you are talking about, because it's a tool where a lot of us are already familiar with and we have the list of all the recommendations, including the one from the CCT, from the SSR2, from ATRT3, from Work Stream 2, and so on and so forth. Therefore, it's a tool we're used to work with. I suggest that you discuss that with Cheryl and with others, if you wish.

My second point is that you are the member of this ICANN Working Group on prioritization, and therefore, you know the tools they are developing. It may be also interesting to see where we are with that compared with the topic you are talking about. I hope that it's clear what I am saying. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Sébastien, it was very clear. You're absolutely right. I did bring up that effort that Cheryl led, that you and I were both involved in. It's a good tool. I don't know whether or not we've put it in public forum or not. We use it as a tool in our participation in the ICANN-wide prioritization efforts. Yes, I think we're going to just need to go further. I think we're going to need to go further even than we did, as the Board kind of makes the rounds to different groups and kind of says, "Hey, what's absolutely essential?" as they try to design this, if not 18 months, but an expedited plan.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Jonathan, we can change them but we put some priority already on all that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We did. Agreed, yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Therefore, we don't need to start from a clean sheet. We can evolve what we said, taking into account the discussion you put on the table how to be more responsive with the next round of TLDs. Maybe this subgroup can meet quite quickly and update where this document must be, because it's now, I guess, two months we didn't meet, and therefore, that it could be a tool for all of us participating at ICANN76 to take into account this discussion. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. I think those are great recommendations. Other questions or comments? Like I said, I think that's going to be our session, but we only have an hour or whatever. It can't be the first time that anybody participating in that conversation is thinking about it. So I'll get with Cheryl. Chantelle and I will get with Cheryl to look at the tool that we created and see if it's in a shape that we can just share it as a research tool for folks to prepare for that conversation. And then we'll go through it with all of you on the next call so that it's clear how to use it. We'll see if we can move forward in that way. But I think that's going to be a big part of what we're trying to accomplish during the next ICANN meeting.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Jonathan, if I may. First of all, if Cheryl can be on the CPWG next week's call, I hope that she can, but if she can't, I can offer to help, I guess, with Olivier to explain how the tool was built and how to use it, if you need that and if you wish.

My second point is that I guess I saw that there was one hour from the OFB that was canceled. Maybe you can take it back and use it to have this discussion with more time than just one hour. At least it will be my suggestion to use this time because I feel that it could be a good time. Very useful. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Let's get with that. We'll figure out a time maybe for that sub team to meet quickly. Agree. Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I was talking more about during the ICANN meeting. There is a slot that's supposed to be used.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought because there was an OFB meeting that I put up here before. During the meeting. I guess that's interesting to expand on the time that we spend on this topic or divided up between the policy and overhead and finance aspects of those priorities. That's also possible as well. All right. That makes sense. Thanks, Sébastien.

So that is the big conversation going forward. I guess you all start having the conversation on what the Board can do to better appreciate your

volunteer work. I don't know if more needs to happen on that. I confess I haven't gone back and listened to that. I should listen to that conversation. Hadia and Olivier, how did that conversation go? How well prepared are we to discuss it with the Board?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, I'm not quite sure how well are we prepared to discuss it with the Board. I'm not quite sure whether we are or not. We did have some comments. There was very little additional input that we got on our last call on these things. So maybe we can reopen that. I mean the last week we said, "Okay, we'll reopen the discussion this week and see if there's any points and anything that we need to push for specifically."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. So that's going to be a big part of ICANN76. That's a session that we have, and maybe it's two sessions as we look at it, two time slots if we look at taking up the OFB session as well. Because I think it's going to be the biggest task in front of us, really, to sort of participate in the construction of an expedited plan for moving towards a new round. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. I should just add, part of the discussion last week was the answer to the question, what can the Board do to better appreciate your volunteer work? Some mentioned that perhaps the Board providing responses to the ALAC advice was one of the things, knowing that there's a lot of ALAC advice that's currently in the pipeline and that

has not been addressed yet. But the gist of the discussion that we had last week was that indeed there might be a full pipeline at the moment, but a lot of it depends on other processes that are taking place outside of the ALAC. And when the Board treats a specific issue and has to consider all of the input at the same time, a lot of it is pending everywhere else. This is why much of the advice that has been provided to the Board is still showing as pending, even though it's been provided quite some time ago, because the rest of the processes are not up to date to be able to deal with that advice yet, not because the ALAC advice is not important enough. I think I've paraphrased. Avri very much helped us last week in telling us some of this. That's it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I think that's definitely the case with some of it for sure where there are dependencies that are in place. I mean, obviously, there's CCT recommendations that have been endorsed a few times by a number of different groups that have gone on kind of indefinitely where the problem is different. But definitely many of the things that we've recommended on Subsequent Procedures are kind of continuing on work happening around the community, for sure. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. When I think about pressing issues, pending implementation for end users, what are the issues that really impact and affect end users when using the Internet, even if they don't know what the name of this issue is? When I think about that, I think about DNS abuse. I really think that being safe on the Internet, being able to put your credit

card or buy services online safely, I would say this is the pressing issue. Even though we know common users, if you ask them, they don't know what the name of this issue is, but they know that what they care about is actually being safe on the Internet. What actually is pending in relation to DNS abuse? I guess this is what really needs to be identified. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're absolutely right, Hadia. Frankly, that's the criteria that ought to be applied to almost everything that we do, right? So then it's just the more intensified version of that that we need to apply in this case in trying to find the absolute priorities, the absolute must-haves prior to new applications. I mean, the complexity of the DNS abuse topic right now is that our waving arms around about that topic, starting with ICANN67, I think that led to a lot to happen. A lot of different groups, momentum in different places, and try to assess where those things are, whether they're far enough along, etc., is part of that exercise, so that we're no longer just saying more has to be done at DNS abuse but get as specific as we can and be realistic about what to take place in the next couple of years.

Any other questions or comments? So I've started some homework here to staff. We'll try to schedule some things and work on some resources to circulate to get people thinking about this. We'll be back in touch. But that's the thing to think about. What's your favorite At-Large recommendation that you want to fight for prior to the round? Amrita, go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Jonathan. Just a question to ponder. While DNS abuse is definitely an issue for a user who is purchasing domain names using domain name, I think redressal of grievances, which could also be law enforcement trying to understand when the cybercrime has happened because the WHOIS database is still not open and they do not have access, is a pressing issue. So, perhaps do we want to see if At-Large did make some recommendations along with GAC? Has there been any improvement in facilitating cases of users being resolved by the law enforcement? Is this something that we would want to consider? Because that is an end user issue, getting access to correct information.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Amrita. I am going to do what Avri loves and put her on the spot. I know that the Board has set those two things as priorities. I'm wondering, is the SSAD Light or the WHOIS Disclosure System considered critical path to a new round, or are they are they just simply considered parallel priorities? Go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri offering to be on the spot. I think that more traveling in parallel, I mean, DNS abuse as a general topic is definitely in the SubPro chain of things that need to be dealt with, but not specifically whatever we're calling the SSAD Light these days. I think they're both traveling along as sort of parallel work items and priorities, both high, but neither one dependent on the other.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, great. That was my understanding as well. So part of the conversation Amrita might be raising is whether or not SSAD Light or whatever needs to be critical path for the other. And if we form that position, then it's worth expressing because it's not a given at this point. I guess that's really the question I was asking. So thank you.

Any other questions or comments? All right. Thank you for your indulgence. We'll continue to work on this topic. And with that, I think I'll pass the microphone back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. Once again, I have been looking at the participants list and no one being able to take us back to our agenda item number three. So we'll have some updates, no doubt, next week on maybe not all, but many of the topics that we didn't touch on today. And that means we can now go with agenda number six, Any Other Business? I'm not seeing any hands up. Nope, no hands at the moment.

Okay. That means we then have to just look at our next meeting, and that's next week. That's going to be of course the ICANN Prep Week. Some people have mentioned they might not be able to make it if there is a conflict with some of the ICANN Prep Week sessions. But let's have a look.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM:

Thank you, Olivier. As you have said, next week will be ICANN76 Prep Week, which also means that we will not be able to have our regular

interpretation. Unfortunately, we won't be able to use our rotation, which is 19:00 UTC, in order to avoid the clash with the Policy Update webinar which is taking place at 19:00 UTC, next Wednesday. So what we would like to suggest is to hold next week's call at 13:00 UTC, just like this week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. So 13:00 UTC seems to be our only option. I know some people will not be able to make it because of the time zone. But it still allows us to be able to have a call even if it might be a short one. If we haven't gotten many updates, or if we do have updates, that will be just in time to do this policy work, it does not stop in the run up to an ICANN meeting. Quite the contrary, often there's a flurry of activity just before that. Hadia, is there anything else we need to touch on today?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Nothing from my side. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks, everyone, for having participated in today's call. Thanks to our interpreters and the real-time text transcriber. Remember, when you close your Zoom, you will actually be asked a few questions about the transcription service. So if it's been helpful, please do voice this. That's all for this week. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night. Goodbye.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]